SINGLE BENCH

3

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR: C.G.
WRIT PETITION NO. OF 2005
3529

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 227, CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

Petitioner:
Non applicant No.1

Sarhuram Bhagat S/o Kilaram Bhagat,
(owner of Tanker, bearing registration No.C.G. - 14/0701)

R/o Deepatoli, Jashpur Nagar,
District Jashpur (C.G.).

Versus

Respondents:

1) Smt.Rajni Thawait, Wd/o Shri Ramkumar Thawait,

R/o Tilak Nagar, Bilaspur.

2) Ku.Ritu Thawait, D/o Shri Ramkumar Thawait, aged 14 years,

3) Ku.Chanchal Thawait, D/o Shri Ramkumar Thawait, aged 8 years,

Both nos. 2 &3 minors, Through Wali mother Smt.Rajni Thawait.

R/o Tilak Nagar, Near Durga Temple (Chauntpara), Bilaspur, Tahsil & District Bilaspur (C.G.).

----------**Claimants**

4) The Oriental Insurance Co.Ltd,
Through Divisional Manager, Bilaspur.

5) Bajrang Lal Agrawal, aged 45 years, R/o. Bilha Petrol Pump, Bilha Tah. Bilha District Bilaspur ---- Proposed Non-applicant

P.R. No. 2025/05
Presented by Shri N.S. Agrawal
dated 04.05.05

1) **Particulars of the petitioner**:-

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक WP(W).No.2981 **सन्** 2005 29

..... **विरुद्ध** .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	3-8-2005 Shri V. S. Agrawal, counsel for the petitioner. The instant writ petition has been filed by the petitioner questioning the legality, propriety and correctness of the order dated 17-3-2005 passed by the Commissioner for Workmen Compensation, Labour Court Bilaspur in case No.734/WCA/04 whereby the petitioner's application for arraying respondent No.5 herein Bajranglal Agrawal as respondent in the said claim case filed by respondents No.1 to 3 against the petitioner herein under Order 1 Rule 10 of the C.P.C. has been rejected. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the order passed by the Commissioner for Workmen Compensation, Labour Court, Bilaspur. It has been mentioned in the said order that there is no prima facie material on record which shows connection of Bajranglal Agrawal with the truck in question, therefore, the application is rejected. Even during the course of argument, learned counsel for the petitioner admitted that husband of respondent No.1 and the father of respondents No.2 and 3 was working as driver and he died while driving the truck No.C.G.-14/0701 of which the petitioner herein is the registered owner. In view of the above fact, I do not find any illegality or infirmity in the impugned order. The writ petition is liable to be dismissed and it is accordingly dismissed. Consequently, M.(W.)P. No.2981/2005 and I.A. No.6687/2005 also stand disposed of. **Sd/-** **L.C. Bhadoo** **Judge**	

Barve

(पीछे देखिये)